

REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated January 11, 2006 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1, 14, and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-19 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 3-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,823,361 to *Babbs* (hereinafter "*Babbs*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that *Babbs* does not teach every element recited in claims 1 and 3-19. Thus, *Babbs* cannot anticipate these claims.

More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite a cassette device which includes, among other features, supporting bars, where "the supporting bars are configured to distribute a load across the substrate." The Applicant submits that *Babbs* does not disclose this feature. While *Babbs* does disclose support arms 126, the Applicant submits that the support members are not configured to distribute a load across a substrate. In fact, as may be seen in Figure 1, the support arms 126 are configured such that if an article is placed thereon, the support arms would do the exact opposite, they would concentrate a load on the supported article, thereby causing defects on the supported article. Accordingly, *Babbs* does not disclose all the features recited in claim 1 and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Similarly, claims 3 and 7-13, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 4 recites a cassette device which comprises, among other features, "liquid crystal display panels include a first substrate having a plurality of thin film transistor arrays and a second substrate having a plurality of color filters such that the first and second substrates are bonded together." The Applicant submits that *Babbs* does not disclose this feature. Accordingly, claim 4, along with claims 5 and 6, which depend therefrom, is patentable over the cited reference and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite a cassette device for supporting substrates which includes, among other features, at least two supporting bars, "wherein the at least two supporting bars are configured to distribute a load across a substrate supported thereon." As previously detailed, *Babbs* does not disclose this feature. Thus, claim 14, along with claims 15-17 which depend therefrom, is patentable over the cited reference and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite a cassette device for supporting substrates comprising, among other features, at least two supporting bars "wherein the at least two supporting bars are configured to distribute a load across a substrate supported thereon." As outlined above, *Babbs* does not disclose this feature. Accordingly, claim 18 along with claim 19 which depends from claim 18, is patentable over *Babbs* and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Babbs* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,236,548 to *Stadler et al.* (hereinafter "*Stadler*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior

art.” The Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Babbs* nor *Stadler*, either singularly or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claim 2. As detailed above, *Babbs* fails to disclose all the features recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claim 2 depends. Moreover, *Stadler* fails to address the previously noted shortcomings of *Babbs*. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over the cited references and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: April 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rebecca G. Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant